



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,783	09/11/2006	Rickard Carlsson	BERGLUNDS P0320 CIP	1331
27667	7590	66/23/2010		
HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.			EXAMINER	
3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE, SUITE 140			LAMB, BRENDA A	
TUCSON, AZ 85718				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/23/2010	ELECTRONIC			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

admin@hayes-soloway.com  
smckniff@hayes-soloway.com  
nsoloway@hayes-soloway.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/598,783	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CARLSSON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Brenda A. Lamb	<b>Art Unit</b> 1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2010.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 26,28-34 and 38 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 26,28-34 and 38 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/88/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MARCUSE 2,809,082.

MARCUSE teaches the design of a dispensing apparatus as shown in Fig. 4 which is comprised of the following elements: a feed roller for dispensing paper which is arranged below the top surface or lid of the dispenser; a paper magazine or container. MARCUSE device is capable of being refillable from below the top surface of the dispenser wherein when the paper is completely filled the web is capable of flowing from adjacent or near the top portion of the magazine to behind the magazine to the feed roller. MARCUSE teaches the feed roller 108 may be motor driven. MARCUSE

teaches every positively claimed element of the device. Thus every element of the claimed apparatus is taught by MARCUSE.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MARCUSE 2,809,082 in view of BOONE 3,796,185.

MARCUSE is applied for the reasons noted above but fails to teach a sprayer for spraying paper. However, it would have been obvious to modify the MARCUSE device by arranging a spraying device adjacent the exit opening of the device such as shown by Boone in Figure 6 for the taught advantage of enabling one to impregnate the paper with a desired material.

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MARCUSE 2,809,082 in view of DISANTO 5,782,380.

MARCUSE is applied for the reasons noted above. MARCUSE fails to teach his dispenser system is swivable or pivotable. However, DISANTO teaches the use of at least pivotable shelf in a dispenser system to obviously enable one provide greater access of the interior of the housing (see DISANTO at column 2 lines 13-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the MARCUSE paper dispensing system by pivotably or swivelably mounting a wall in its compartment since DiSanto teaches pivotably or swivelably mounting its shelving system in MARCUSE housing system to obviously enable one provide greater access of the interior of the housing (see DISANTO at column 2 lines 13-23).

Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MARCUSE 2,809,082 in view of CHEN 5,265,509.

MARCUSE is applied for the reasons noted above. MARCUSE fails to teach a sprayer for spraying paper and associate with the sprayer control electronics as set forth in claim 29 and fails to teach a perforating or cutting tool such as within the scope of claims 32 and 34. Chen teaches the design of a dispenser which is comprised of the following elements: a motor drive 50 for dispensing the substrate; a cutting tool 6 for cutting the substrate to a desired length, wherein the perforator in his apparatus can include a knife with a number of adjacent knife tips or saw-toothed cutting edge; a sprayer or nozzle 34 for spraying a material; control electronics for feeding different amounts of material on the substrate (column 3 line 59 to column 4 line 14). Chen teaches his apparatus includes using a folded substrate perpendicular to the longitudinal direction of the substrate. However, it would have been obvious to modify the MARCUSE device by arranging a spraying device near its feed roller and associate with the sprayer - control electronics for controlling feeding different amounts of material on the substrate such as shown by CHEN (column 3 line 59 to column 4 line 14) for the taught advantage of enabling one to impregnate the paper with a desired material. Thus claims 28-29 are obvious over the above cited references. Further, it would have been obvious given the modifications of the MARCUSE device by providing a knife within the scope of claims 32 and 34 for the obvious advantage of providing a paper sheet of the desired size.

Claims 30-31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MARCUSE 2,809,082 in view of Watanabe 5,131,302.

MARCUSE is applied for the reasons noted above but fails to teach the contact free activation sensor and rubber rings contacting the paper. However, Watanabe teaches the design of a dispenser which is comprised of the following elements: a motor drive for dispensing the paper; a sensor 34 for sensing movement of the user's hand in front of the sensor to provide contact free activation of dispensing of paper therefrom; a cutting tool (elements 24b,24a) for cutting the substrate to a desired length; and a feeding device including on a roller (elements 10,11) arranged with rubber rings that are in contact with paper. Watanabe dispenser is capable of dispensing a substrate within the scope of the claim since it teaches every element of the claimed apparatus. Note it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ 2d 1647 (1987). "[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does." *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Therefore, it would have been obvious given the modifications of the MARCUSE as discussed above to include a contact free activation sensor such as taught by Watanabe to activate the rollers to dispense paper through the dispenser for the obvious advantage of automation of the dispensing process by the user – increase ease of use. Further, it would have been obvious given the modifications of the MARCUSE dispenser as discussed above to provide rubber rings on the roller contacting the paper as taught by Watanabe to obviously enable one to firmly grip the paper for movement through the dispenser.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda A. Lamb whose telephone number is (571) 272-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on Wednesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton, can be reached on (571) 272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 1792

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brenda A Lamb  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1792

/Brenda A Lamb/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792